

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**DAVID L. WASHINGTON,**

**Petitioner,**

**v.**

**Civil Action No. 2:09cv74**

**EDWARD REILLY, JR.,  
and JAMES CROSS, Warden,**

**Respondent.**

**ORDER**

It will be recalled that on August 27, 2009, Magistrate Judge David J. Joel filed his Report and Recommendation, wherein the parties were directed, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), to file with the Clerk of Court any written objections within ten (10) days after being served with a copy of the Report and Recommendation. Petitioner filed his objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation on September 4, 2009.

Upon examination of the report from the Magistrate Judge, it appears to the Court that the issues raised by the Petitioner in his Petition, filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2241, wherein Petitioner challenges the constitutionality of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Act of 1997, were thoroughly considered by Magistrate Judge Joel in his Report and Recommendation, as was the Respondent's Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment.

Moreover, the Court, upon an independent de novo consideration of all matters now before it, is of the opinion that the Report and Recommendation accurately reflects the law applicable to the facts and circumstances before the Court in this action. Upon review of the Petitioner's objections, the Court finds that the Petitioner has not raised any

issues that were not already fully considered and addressed by Magistrate Judge Joel.

Therefore, it is

**ORDERED** that Magistrate Judge Joel's Report and Recommendation be, and the same hereby is, accepted in whole and that this civil action be disposed of in accordance with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, it is

**ORDERED** that Respondent's Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment be, and the same hereby is, **GRANTED**. It is further

**ORDERED** that the Petitioner's Application for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2241 shall be, and the same hereby is, **DENIED** and **DISMISSED with prejudice**. It is further

**ORDERED** that the above-styled action shall be **STRICKEN** from the docket of this Court. It is further

**ORDERED** that the Clerk shall enter judgment for the Respondent. It is further

**ORDERED** that, if a party should desire to appeal the decision of this Court, written notice of appeal must be received by the Clerk of this Court within thirty (30) days from the date of the entry of the Judgment Order, pursuant to Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. The \$5.00 filing fee for the notice of appeal and the \$450.00 docketing fee should also be submitted with the notice of appeal. In the alternative, at the time the notice of appeal is submitted, Petitioner may, in accordance with the provisions of Rule 24(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, seek leave to proceed in forma pauperis from the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

**ENTER:** October 21, 2009

/S/ Robert E. Maxwell  
United States District Judge